



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,124	07/12/2001	DuWayne C. Radke	56908US002	1697

32692 7590 09/03/2003

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

GREEN, CHRISTY MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/904,124

Applicant(s)

RADKE ET AL.

Examiner

Christy M Green

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a third office action for serial number 09/904124, entitled Pass-Through Fire Stop Device, filed on July 12, 2001.

Response to Amendment

In response to the examiner's office action dated August 26, 2003, the applicant has made no amendments to the application. The indicated allowability of claim 2 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Rodriguez. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munzenberger et al., US patent # 6,161,393 in view of Rodriguez, US Patent 5,588,267.

Munzenberger discloses the claimed invention including a firestop device (figure 2) comprising a housing (7), firestop material (11) arranged within the housing; the housing comprising a base portion (3) and a riser portion (7), the base portion including a recess (where 11 points to); the base portion includes a sidewall portion (where 3 points to) extending from a first open end (10) towards the riser portion (7), and a shoulder portion (2) extending inwardly from the sidewall portion to the riser portion (7); the sidewall (3) and shoulder (2) portions include inner surfaces having a rib (15); the housing has a first and second opposed open ends (10 and the opposite side of 10) and a hollow chamber (where 12 is located) having a longitudinal axis extending from the first open end to the second open end (figure 2); the first open end (10) is provided in the base portion (where 3 points to) and the second open end is provided in the riser

portion (7), the firestop material (11) being provided in spaced relation (by 13) along the sidewall portion inner surface from the first open end to the shoulder portion (figure 2); the housing has a two-tiered cylindrical shape (figure 2) the base portion (3) having a larger diameter than the riser portion (7); the base portion further includes a flange (4) adjacent the first open end (10); the riser portion (7) includes a plurality of equally segmented transverse bands (8) each including manually engageable pull tab (where 8 points to); a cap (9) attached to the riser portion (7); the cap contains snap connectors (see attached figure 2) that snap onto the riser portion; a retaining ring (4) arranged within the base portion first open end adjacent the firestop material.

Munzenberger does not disclose the housing including at least one frangible connection defining a removable band. Rodriguez teaches that it is known in the art to provide at least one frangible connection (20) defining a removable band (where 5 points to); and a pull tab (25) providing a grasping means (column 4, lines 28-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the frangible connection of the housing and the pull tab to grasp the band of Rodriguez with the housing of the firestop device of Munzenberger in order to provide different lengths of the housing for different sized walls (column 1, lines 35-37).

In regards to claims 11 and 14, Munzenberger in view of Zajac discloses the claimed invention as stated above in claim 1, except for the pull tabs includes indicia indicating the length of the device and an extension member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

provide indicia on the pull tabs indicating the length of the device and an extension member since indicia indicating the length of a device (such as used in a ruler) and an extension member which can be attached to extend the housing/riser portion is well known in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/12/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a device including at least one frangible connection *transecting the housing* defining a removable band) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the present invention, in contrast, relates to firestop devices for preventing the spread of fire and smoke from one compartment of a building to another, and roof flashings of Rodriguez are used to seal around pipes extending through roofs or other exterior walls of houses and other buildings, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a

Art Unit: 3635

process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation for the rejection is found in the knowledge generally available to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3635

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christy M Green whose telephone number is 703-308-9693. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached on 703-308-0839. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.


cg

August 26, 2003


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600